



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/779,046	02/07/2001	Sheng Dong	80398.P388	4431

7590

12/22/2003

Maria McCormack Sobrino
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
7th Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/779,046

Applicant(s)

DONG ET AL.

Examiner

Peng Ke

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-25, 27-29, and 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Humpleman et al. (US 6,603,488).

As per claim 1, Humpleman et al. teaches a method comprising:

determining an identification corresponding to a device; and remotely loading a user interface from a remote source wherein the user interface corresponds to the identification of the device (col. 2, lines 42-68).

As per claim 3, Humpleman et al. teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

remotely searching for a user interface corresponding to the identification (col. 15, lines 35-44, col. 16, lines 44-53).

As per claim 4, Humpleman et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the remote source includes the World Wide Web (col. 5, lines 48-65).

As per claim 5, Humpleman et al. teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

remotely loading a user interface corresponding to the identification if a user interface corresponding to the identification is not found by searching locally (col. 8, lines 22-45).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 6, Humpleman et al. teaches the method of claim 5, wherein locally searching includes searching the storage medium of a controller (col. 8, lines 22-45).

As per claim 7, Humpleman et al. teaches the method of claim 3, further comprising: loading a basic user interface if a user interface corresponding to the identification is not found by searching remotely (col. 16, lines 39-44, Examiner interprets non-responsive interface to be the basic user interface).

As per claim 8, Humpleman et al. teaches the method of claim 7, wherein the basic user interface can be modified through an user input (col. 18, lines 38-68, col. 19, lines 1-8).

As per claim 9, Humpleman et al. teaches method of claim 1, wherein the user interface is loaded on a controller (fig. 10, items 706).

As per claim 10, Humpleman et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the user interface controls the device (fig. 10, item 706) operation.

As per claim 11, Humpleman et al. teaches a method comprising:

determining an identification corresponding to a device;

loading a particular user interface wherein the particular user interface corresponds to the identification of the device (col. 2, lines 42-68); and

loading a basic user interface if the particular user interface is not found (col. 16, lines 39-44, Examiner interprets non-responsive interface to be the basic user interface).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 5 (see rejection above).

As per claim 14, Humpleman et al. teaches the method of claim 13, wherein locally searching includes searching a storage medium of a controller (col. 8, lines 22-45).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 4 (see rejection above).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 8 (see rejection above).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 10 (see rejection above).

As per claim 19, it is rejection with same rationale as claim 11, (see rejection above)

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 19, it is of the same scope as claim 2. (see rejection above).

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 19, it is of the same scope as claim 5. (see rejection above).

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 19, Humpleman further teaches the device controller of claim 19, wherein the first communication medium is an IEEE 1394 protocol compliant (col. 5, lines 54-65).

As per claim 23, Humpleman teaches the device controller of claim 20, wherein searching the remote network includes searching across the first communication medium (col. 8, lines 22-45, Examiner interprets the attached server to be first communication medium)

As per claim 24, Humpleman teaches the device controller of claim 23, wherein the first communication medium the World Wide Web (Fig. 3B).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 25, Humpleman teaches the device controller of claim 20, wherein the storage medium is selected from the group consisting of memory and storage devices (col. 8, lines 22-45, It is inherent for the information regarding the devices to be stored on the storage devices).

As per claim 27, Humpleman teaches the device controller of claim 19, further comprising a library of customizing tools for a user to modify the basic user interface prior to the loading on the device controller (Fig. 11, item “preferences”).

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 19, it is of the same scope as claim 9. (see rejection above).

As per claim 29, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 29, it is of same scope as claim 2. (see rejection above)

As per claim 32, which is dependent on claim 29, it is of same scope as claim 4. (see rejection above)

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 29, it is of same scope as claim 5. (see rejection above)

As per claim 34, Humpleman teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein locally searching includes searching the storage medium of a controller (col. 8, lines 22-45).

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 29, it is of same scope as claim 7. (see rejection above).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 29, it is of same scope as claim 8. (see rejection above).

As per claim 37, which is dependent on claim 29, it is of same scope as claim 8. (see rejection above).

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 29, it is of same scope as claim 10. (see rejection above).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 12, 26, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman et al. (US 6,603,488) in view of Ramachandran et al. (US 6,631,351)

As per claim 2, Humpleman et al. teaches the method of claim 1. However, Humpleman fails to teach wherein the identification is selected from the group consisting of global unique identification (GUID) and unit information (UINFO).

Ramachandran et al. teaches teach wherein the identification is selected from the group consisting of global unique identification (GUID) (col. 16, lines 1-3) and unit information (UINFO) (col. 9, line 48-51).

Art Unit: 2174

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Ramachandran et al.'s teaching with Humpleman et al.'s method in order to simplify system device identification process.

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 2. (see rejection above)

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 19, it is of the same scope as claim 2. (see rejection above)

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 29, it is of the same scope as claim 2. (see rejection above)

Conclusion

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to user interface management for controlled devices:

Reisman (US 2003/0229900) discloses: a method and apparatus for browsing using multiple coordinated device set.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (703) 305-7615. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/779,046

Page 8

Art Unit: 2174

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Peng Ke